

Sciacca, Scott M.

From: Loos, Thomas [loos@mbhb.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2011 3:39 PM
To: Sciacca, Scott M.
Cc: Machonkin, Rick; Laske, Jessica
Subject: USPA 09/684,706 - Agenda for Interview on 11 July 2011 @ 11 AM Central / Noon Eastern (Docket No. 08-880-US5)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Red

Examiner Sciacca,

Thank you for calling me today and agreeing to have an interview for USPA 09/684,706. As we discussed today, our interview will be on Monday July 11, 2011 at 11 AM Central time (noon Eastern). I plan to call you at your desk number – 571 270 1919 – for our interview.

My proposed agenda is to discuss the current 103 rejections for at least 3 independent claims: claims 1, 63, and 92.

For our interview, I propose the following amendments to independent claims 1 and 63:

1. (Currently amended) A sensor network comprising a plurality of network elements including at least one node configured to be coupled among a monitored environment,

wherein the at least one node is further configured to be remotely controllable and to determine an energy cost for communication and a message priority, wherein the energy cost is determined based on one or more attenuation values, wherein the one or more attenuation values comprise at least one attenuation value for wireless communication and at least one attenuation value for wired communication,

wherein the at least one node is further configured to distribute objects for data processing to one or more of the plurality of network elements, wherein the objects for data processing comprise data and executable code, and

wherein the distribution of the objects for data processing varies based on the energy cost for communication and the message priority.

63. (Currently amended) A sensor network including at least one node configured to be coupled among an environment, and

wherein the at least one node comprises a first node configured to operate at least one real time process using at least a first processor and operate at least one non-real time process using at least a second processor, wherein the first processor is configured to provide a plurality of commands to the second processor collectively, and wherein the second processor is configured to store and subsequently execute the plurality of commands,

wherein the at least one node is further configured to determine an energy cost for communication and a message priority, wherein the energy cost is determined based on one or more attenuation values,

wherein the at least one node is further configured to distribute data processing in the sensor network, and

wherein the distribution of the data processing varies based on the energy cost for communication and the message priority.

We further propose making similar amendments to those shown above for claim 1 to

independent claims 83, 101, 103, and 112.

Regarding claim 1, the proposed amendment to claim 1 incorporates the subject matter of previous claim 11. For claim 1, I am prepared to argue that the cited art generally, and Larsen in particular, does not disclose or suggest both “at least one wired attenuation value” and “at least one wireless attenuation value.” Rather, at best, Larsen asserts that system can be used in other types of networks, but does not provide any details other than for a “packet radio” system. Therefore, Larsen does not disclose or suggest at least “one wired attenuation value”, much less both “at least one wired attenuation value” and “at least one wireless attenuation value.”

Regarding claim 63, I am prepared to argue that the cited art generally, and Minoz in particular, does not disclose one processor configured for providing a plurality of commands to a second processor collectively, and the second processor is configured for storing and executing the provided plurality of commands. Rather, Minoz describes a command-by-command communication protocol, which does not include transfer of commands “collectively” or storing and subsequent execution of pluralities of commands, as recited in amended claim 63.

Regarding claim 92, I do not have any proposed amendments for our discussion. Rather, I am prepared to argue that Dupont describes multi-priority transmission, where lower priority processes can be locked out for time periods from transmitting messages, while higher-class processes can transmit during those time periods. In contrast, claim 92 recites in part, “wherein, in response to receipt of the high priority message code, the at least one node is configured to broadcast one or more inhibit messages configured to inhibit messaging from nodes not engaged in conveying the high priority event” That is, claim 92 recites inhibiting “messaging from nodes not engaged in conveying the high priority event,” not inhibiting messages based on priority.

While we may discuss other art and claims, I believe we can stick to the claims and art mentioned in this agenda.

I look forward to our discussion on Monday.

Sincerely,

Tom
312 913 3338